

REMARKS

The Office Action has been carefully reviewed. Claims 1, 2, 5-10, 20-22, 27-31 and 35 are allowed. Claim 12 also presently appear in this application and is only objected to as being dependent from rejected claim 11 but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Remaining claim 11 also defines patentable subject matter warranting its allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are hereby respectfully solicited.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for the recitation of the 8th species on page 11 and the 4th species on page 26 of the amendment filed June 3, 2010. This rejection is obviated by the deletion without prejudice of the 8th species, 4-chloro-N-({5-[(4-hydroxypiperidin-1-yl)sulfonyl]thien-s-yl}methyl) benzamide, on page 11 and the 4th species, which is believed to be N-[(5-{[4-(hexyloxy)piperidin-1-yl)sulfonyl}thien-2-yl_methyl]3-methoxy benzamide and not a species beginning with "4-chloro-N-" as indicated by the examiner, on page 26.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, rejection(s) are therefore respectfully requested.

As it is believed that claim 11 as amended is now also allowable, objected to claim 12 which is dependent from

Appln. No. 10/070,954
Amdt. dated February 10, 2011
Reply to Office Action of November 12, 2010

claim 11 is also allowable as well and need not be rewritten in independent form.

In view of the above, the claims comply with 35 U.S.C. §112 and define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance. Favorable consideration and early allowance are earnestly urged.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By /ACY/
Allen C. Yun
Registration No. 37,971

ACY:pp
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
G:\BNS\Ser1\Arkin\install1\PTO\2011-02-10Amendment.doc